UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,994	08/02/2001	Rui Xie	D-6400 CIP	8016
Crompton Cor	7590 03/29/2007		EXAM	INER
Benson Road	-		SERGENT, RABON A ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Middlebury, C	1 06/49			
			1711	
		·		
SHORTENED STATUTO	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MC	ONTHS	03/29/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

			U
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/919,994	XIE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rabon Sergent	1711	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	-
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r lod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communical ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ T 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	his action is non-final. wance except for formal matt	, •	is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,7-12,29,32 and 33 is/are pendidential 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdential 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-12, 29, 32, and 33 is/are rejection and claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and complex application Papers	lrawn from consideration.		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a	ccepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	-	· · ·	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date	
Notice of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-946)		formal Patent Application	

Art Unit: 1711

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 27, 2006 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-4, 7-12, 29, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The examiner has reviewed the specification and has not found support for the use of a first solvent and a second solvent or for multiple additions of solvent at different stages of the process. Furthermore, since the specification is silent regarding the use of a first and second solvent or the multiple additions of solvent at different stages of the process, such features as the relationship of one solvent to the other, how and when the second solvent is introduced into the system, and how or if the first solvent is removed cannot be determined.

3. Claim 1-4, 7-12, 29, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As aforementioned, support has not been found for the use of a first solvent and a second solvent or for the multiple additions of solvent at different stages of the process; therefore, the

Art Unit: 1711

position is taken that applicants have failed to provide adequate enablement for the use of multiple solvent components or multiple solvent additions within a process for removing free polyisocyanate monomer from a prepolymer composition. Absent guidance with respect to the use of such multiple solvent components or multiple additions, the position is taken that the skilled artisan could not practice the invention without resorting to undue experimentation. *In re*

4. Claims 1-4, 7-12, 29, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicants' amendments relating to the use of a first solvent and a second solvent render the claims indefinite, because the relationship of one solvent to the other, how and when the second solvent is introduced into the system, and the removal of the first solvent cannot be determined. Furthermore, it is unclear if the first solvent and second solvent can be satisfied by a single solvent component.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (571) 272-1079.

RABON SERGENT PRIMARY EXAMINER

R. Sergent March 27, 2007